

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner pointed out that claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6520468 to Lee et al. in view of US Patent 6139279 to Pearce et al, however, applicant couldn't agree
5 more on this, and the grounds are explained as follows:

The most distinctive characteristic of the present invention relative to the cited prior arts LEE and Pearce is the canopy 50 defined with a slot 51 which can enable the ceiling fan of the present invention to be mounted either on a horizontal ceiling or a slanted (non-level) ceiling. Furthermore, the
10 canopy 50 in accordance with the present invention can not only be used to cover the suspension structure but also to cover the motor of the ceiling fan, thus, the appearance of ceiling fan is improved. However, Lee and other cited references don't disclose such a canopy 50, and the canopy disclosed by Pearce is not defined with such a slot that is sized to permit the swing of the
15 download therein, and the canopy of Pearce is unable to cover the motor of the ceiling fan either.

Furthermore, the Examiner pointed out that Lee et al. teaches all elements above except the canopy. However, the applicant couldn't agree with this conclusion. Despite Lee's suspension bracket 10 is structurally and
20 functionally similar to the mounting bracket 10 of the present invention, the applicant submits that the present invention has more advantages as compared with Lee. And the advantages are explained as follows:

First, a mounting bracket 10 of Lee is also provided with a central mount 2 equivalent to the sunk platform of the present invention, the sunk platform is integrally formed with the mounting bracket 10, however, the central mount 2 of Lee itself is an independent unit and needs to be produced separately from the mounting bracket 10, thus, Lee's assembly is time-consuming and high cost relative to the present invention.

Second, the Examiner said that the fixing plate 3 is equivalent to the C-shaped ring 20 of the present invention. However, as mentioned in specification of the present invention that "About the periphery of the hole 21 of the C-shape ring 20 is an inner arc surface 22 with a predetermined height defined", and such structures "will provide sufficient support for the suspending element 32 in such a manner that the positive cambered surface 33 of the downrod 30 being securely and fully supported by the inner arc surface 22 of the hole 21 of the C-shape ring 20". Nevertheless, the fixing plate 3 of Lee is thin in thickness and unable to provide a stable support for the ball 22 (the suspending element), and the fixing plate 3 actually plays the same role as the limiter 40 of the present invention to prevent the disengagement of the down rod from the mounting bracket. Thereby, in fact, Lee fails to disclose such a component equivalent to the C-shaped ring of the present invention.

In view of the foregoing grounds, applicant submits that the present invention is substantially patentable over LEE, Pearce and other cited references.

Applicant respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be
issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

5

By: Charles E. Baxley

Charles E. Baxley

Attorney of Record

10

USPTO Reg. 20, 149

90 John Street, Third Floor

New York, New York 10038

Telephone 212-791-7200

Facsimile 212-791-7276

15